



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/028,579	12/19/2001	Patrick R. Clark	01-331	3272
58982	7590	10/10/2007		
CATERPILLAR/FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, L.L.P.				
901 New York Avenue, NW				
WASHINGTON, DC 20001-4413				
EXAMINER				
BATES, KEVIN T				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2155				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
10/10/2007		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

mn

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/028,579	Applicant(s) CLARK ET AL.	
	Examiner Kevin Bates	Art Unit 2155	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 September 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10, 25-37 and 52-55 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10, 25-37, and 52-55 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Response to Amendment

This Office Action is in response to a communication made on September 20, 2007.

Claims 11-24 and 38-51 have been cancelled.

Claims 1, 4-6, 10, 25, 37, 52-54 have been amended.

Claim 55 has been newly added.

Claims 1-10, 25-37, and 52-55 are pending in this application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-2, 6-8, 10, 25-29, 33-35, 37, and 52-54 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Monday (6480860) in view of Alavi (6704723).

Regarding claim 1, Monday teaches a computer based method for retrieving information for use by a requester application (Column 1, lines 49 – 51), comprising the steps of:

sending, by the requestor application, an information request to a master pivot program (Column 4, lines 63 – 65), the information request including document information related to a requested information document;

retrieving the document information from the information request (Column 5, lines 32 – 34);

retrieving document retrieval information from a configuration database as a function of the document information (Column 7, lines 28 – 30), the document retrieval information including a destination system (Column 7, lines 28 – 30);

sending the document retrieval information and the information request to a destination pivot program coupled to the destination system;

retrieving the requested information document from the destination system by the destination pivot program (Column 7, lines 53 – 57); and,

sending the requested information document to the requester application (Column 7, lines 64 – 67) wherein the document is used in a financing transaction.

Monday does not explicitly indicate that the retrieved documents are financial documents and are part of a group of requested financing documents.

Alavi teaches a system of retrieving documents from a database system through a pivot program (Column 4, lines 14 – 28). Alavi teaches the databases in the system are including financial information and reports (Column 2, line 67 – Column 3, line 4). Alavi teaches that each query or queries generate a set of results that can get returned to the client (Column 4, lines 54 – 56).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use Alavi's teaching to include financial information and documents in Monday's teaching of retrieving documents in order to allow the client to query the system in order to receiving business type information stored in databases.

Regarding claims 25 and 55, Monday teaches a computer based system for retrieving information for use in a financing transaction (Column 1, lines 49 – 51), comprising:

a requestor application for generating an information request (Column 4, lines 63 – 65), the information request including document information related to a requested information document (Column 5, lines 32 – 34);

a configuration database containing document retrieval information (Column 7, lines 32 – 41); and

a master pivot program, coupled to the requestor application and the configuration database (Figure 2, element 125, the pivot program, 123, the requestor, and 250, the configuration database), for receiving the information request, retrieving the document information from the information request (Column 7, lines 28 – 30), and retrieving document retrieval information for the requested information document from the configuration database as a function of the document information, (Column 5, lines 54 – 57) and for retrieving the requested information document from a destination system using the document retrieval information (Column 7, lines 60 – 61) wherein the document is used in a financing transaction.

Monday does not explicitly indicate that the retrieved documents are financial documents and are part of a group of requested financing documents.

Alavi teaches a system of retrieving documents from a database system through a pivot program (Column 4, lines 14 – 28). Alavi teaches the databases in the system are including financial information and reports (Column 2, line 67 – Column 3, line 4).

Art Unit: 2155

Alavi teaches that each query or queries generate a set of results that can get returned to the client (Column 4, lines 54 – 56).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use Alavi's teaching to include financial information and documents in Monday's teaching of retrieving documents in order to allow the client to query the system in order to receiving business type information stored in databases.

Regarding claim 52, Monday teaches a computer program product for retrieving information for use a financing transaction (Column 1, lines 49 – 51), the computer readable program code comprising:

computer readable program code means for sending, by the requestor application, an information request to a master pivot program (Column 4, lines 63 – 65), an information request to a master pivot program, the information request including document information related to a requested information document;

computer readable program code means for retrieving the document information from the information request (Column 5, lines 32 – 34);

computer readable program code means for retrieving document retrieval information from a configuration database as a function of the document information (Column 7, lines 28 – 30);

computer readable program code means for retrieving the request information document from a destination using the document retrieval information (Column 7, lines 53 – 57); and

computer readable program code means for sending the requested information document to the requestor application (Column 7, lines 64 – 67) wherein the document is used in a financing transaction.

Monday does not explicitly indicate that the retrieved documents are financial documents and are part of a group of requested financing documents.

Alavi teaches a system of retrieving documents from a database system through a pivot program (Column 4, lines 14 – 28). Alavi teaches the databases in the system are including financial information and reports (Column 2, line 67 – Column 3, line 4). Alavi teaches that each query or queries generate a set of results that can get returned to the client (Column 4, lines 54 – 56).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use Alavi's teaching to include financial information and documents in Monday's teaching of retrieving documents in order to allow the client to query the system in order to receiving business type information stored in databases.

Regarding claims 2 and 29, Monday teaches a computer based method, as set forth in claim 1 and 25, respectively, wherein the information request is an extensible markup language document (Column 5, lines 3 – 5).

Regarding claim 26, Monday teaches a computer based system, as set forth in claim 25, wherein the master pivot program is adapted to deliver the requested information document to the requestor application (Column 7, lines 62 – 67).

Regarding claim 27, Monday teaches a computer based system, as set forth in claim 25, wherein the document retrieval information includes a destination and a master control interface command (Column 7, lines 47 – 50).

Regarding claim 28, Monday teaches a computer based system, as set forth in claim 27, including a master control interface adapted to execute the master control interface command (Column 7, lines 59 – 62).

Regarding claims 6 and 33, Monday teaches a computer based method, as set forth in claims 1 and 25, respectively, including receiving the document retrieval information and the information request by a master control interface (MCI) coupled to the destination pivot program (Column 5, lines 25 – 31, where the bridge and the XML translator is the MCI), the master control interface being adapted to process the information request (Column 5, lines 32 – 34).

Regarding claims 7 and 34, Monday teaches a computer based method, as set forth in claim 6, and 33, respectively, wherein the MCI includes a wrapper computer program application adapted to pass the information request from the MCI to the destination system (Column 5, lines 37 – 41).

Regarding claims 8, and 35, Monday teaches a computer based method, as set forth in claim 1 and 25, respectively, wherein the configuration database is a relational database (Column 7, lines 34 – 41, where the configuration database is the association file with the DTDs).

Regarding claims 10, and 37, Monday teaches a computer based method, as set forth in claim 1 and 25, including selecting the financing document for retrieval based on values of specific data elements in the contract (Column 7, lines 24 – 41).

Regarding claim 53, Monday teaches a computer based method, as set forth in claim 1.

Monday does not explicitly indicate that the financing document is one of a contract document, a lease document, a purchase document, a sales document, and a payment document.

Alavi teaches a system of retrieving documents from a database system through a pivot program (Column 4, lines 14 – 28). Alavi teaches the databases in the system are including financial information and reports (Column 2, line 67 – Column 3, line 4), which includes at least sales (Column 5, lines 7 – 13).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use Alavi's teaching to include financial information and documents in Monday's teaching of retrieving documents in order to allow the client to query the system in order to receiving business type information stored in databases.

Regarding claim 54, Monday teaches a computer based system, as set forth in claim 25.

Monday does not explicitly indicate that the information request includes additional document information related to a second requested information document that is party of the group of requested documents, and the master pivot program is further configured to receive the information request, retrieve the additional document

Art Unit: 2155

information from the request, retrieve additional document retrieval information for the second requested information document from the configuration database as a function of the additional document information, and retrieve the second requested information document from a destination system using the additional document retrieval information.

Alavi teaches a system of retrieving documents from a database system through a pivot program (Column 4, lines 14 – 28) which includes additional document information related to a second requested information document that is party of the group of requested documents, and the master pivot program is further configured to receive the information request, retrieve the additional document information from the request, retrieve additional document retrieval information for the second requested information document from the configuration database as a function of the additional document information, and retrieve the second requested information document from a destination system using the additional document retrieval information (Column 4, lines 48 – 67).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include Alavi's teaching of retrieving a set of results per user request in order to obtain all results from each query not just a single document.

Claims 3-5 and 30-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Monday in view of Alavi, and in further view of Seo (6732360).

Regarding claims 3 and 30, Monday teaches a computer based method, as set forth in claims 1 and 25, respectively.

Monday does not explicitly indicate the step of sending the information request to the master pivot program includes the step of calling an application program interface (API).

Seo teaches a system with a client, a pivot program, and a destination pivot that includes an API interface for communication between the client and the master pivot program (Column 3, lines 21 – 26).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the rejection was made to use Seo's teaching of using an API to communicate between the master pivot and client in Monday's system in order to allow the client to interface with many databases and a JDBC broker as the master pivot (Column 1, lines 18 – 24; lines 59 – 64).

Regarding claims 4 and 31, Monday teaches a computer based method, as set forth in claims 3 and 30.

Monday does not explicitly indicate the step of creating, by the API, a structure of routing information.

Seo teaches a system with an API between a client and a master broker that includes creating a structure of routing information (Column 3, lines 60 – 62; Column 4, lines 8 – 10; lines 16 – 20).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the rejection was made to use Seo's teaching of using an API to communicate between the master pivot and client in Monday's system in order to allow the client to interface with

Art Unit: 2155

many databases and a JDBC broker as the master pivot (Column 1, lines 18 – 24; lines 59 – 64).

Regarding claims 5 and 32, Monday teaches a computer based method, as set forth in claims 4 and 31.

Monday does not explicitly indicate of sending the information request to the master pivot program includes of sending the information request to the master pivot program through a socket.

Seo teaches the step of sending the information request to the master pivot program through a socket (Column 3, lines 54 – 59).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the rejection was made to use Seo's teaching of using an API to communicate between the master pivot and client in Monday's system in order to allow the client to interface with many databases and a JDBC broker as the master pivot (Column 1, lines 18 – 24; lines 59 – 64).

Claim 9 and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Monday in view of Alavi, and in further view of Rutkowski (5826270).

Regarding claims 9 and 36, Monday teaches computer based method, as set forth in claims 1 and 25.

Monday does not explicitly indicate that the configuration database includes routing rules for a plurality of requestor applications and destination applications.

Rutkowski teaches a database system with requestors, a pivot, and databases (Column 4, lines 14 – 21) that includes routing rules for a plurality of requestor applications and destination applications (Column 5, lines 11 – 17).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use Rutkowski's teaching in Monday's system in order to allow multiple requestors issued requests at the same time (Column 2, lines 19 – 24).

Response to Arguments

In response to applicant's argument that the prior art on record does not teach the limitation of performing the steps in a financial transaction or where the documents are for the use of a purchase or lease of equipment, a recitation of the intended use of the claimed invention must result in a structural difference between the claimed invention and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. If the prior art structure is capable of performing the intended use, then it meets the claim.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the

Art Unit: 2155

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kevin Bates whose telephone number is (571) 272-3980. The examiner can normally be reached on 9 am - 5 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Glen Burgess can be reached on (571) 272-3949. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

92 TBT

Kevin Bates
October 4, 2007


GLENON B. BURGESS
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100